

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**

BEST AVAILABLE COPY



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

09/587,419 6/7/00 Kohno et al 11127-002002

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

EXAMINER

D. Jones

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

11016 10

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) *D. Jones* (3) _____
(2) *Chris Mizumoto* (4) _____

Date of Interview *6/24/03*

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Televideo Conference ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, brief description: _____

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: *3, 5 + 7-9*

Identification of prior art discussed: *Jimrich et al (Carbohydrate Research, 1975, Vol. 266 pp. 75-80) + DeRosch et al (US Pat. No. 5,300,280)*

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: *The Examiner and Attorney discussed the final rejection. Applicant's position is the secondary reference (DeRosch et al) does not teach radiolabeled cyclohexane. It was explained that while the primary reference discloses 13C-methyl-cyclohexane, the secondary reference*

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

unmodified + modified cyclohexanes
discussed disclosed & are well known in the art

D. Jones
6/24/03

Except as otherwise provided, a complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application, whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

7 4 5 3 2

§ 1.2. Business to be transacted in writing. All business with the Patent and Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of the interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given, in appropriate page number, placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" list on the file wrapper. In a personal interview, the duplicate copy of the Form is reviewed and given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephonic interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication.

- Application Number of the application
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (personal or telephonic)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the claims discussed
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication, whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the agreement (e.g., claims agreed to being allowed or disagreement to be discussed contrary.)
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview
- Names of other Patent and Trademark Office personnel present.

It is desirable that the examiner orally record the application of the regulations to record the substance of the interview in each case unless both applicant and examiner agree that the examiner will record same. When the examiner agrees to record the substance of the interview, or when it is adequately recorded on the Form or as an attachment to the Form, the examiner should check a box at the bottom of the Form informing the applicant that he need not supplement the Form by submitting a separate record of the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner. The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the argument is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner,
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy:

Applying the principle of the forked-line, the interview should be carefully planned to determine the accuracy of any argument or statement attributed to the examinee during the interview. If there is any possibility that it bears directly on the question of patentability, it should be put forward in the interview. The examiner should not be afraid to ask questions that the examinee should be able to answer. It is better to ask a question and find out that the examinee does not know the answer than to find out that the examinee does not know the answer after the interview has ended. The examiner should also be aware of the fact that the examinee may be able to answer the question after the interview has ended. The examiner should also be aware of the fact that the examinee may be able to answer the question after the interview has ended.